

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LOUIS MARTIN MORAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B162718
(Super. Ct. No. 1058684)
(Santa Barbara County)

Louis Martin Moran appeals an order revoking his probation and sentencing him to two years in prison for committing the offense of petty theft with a prior conviction. (Pen. Code, §§ 666, 484, subd. (a).)¹

On May 14, 2001, appellant pleaded nolo contendere to the offenses of petty theft with a prior conviction (a felony) and dissuading a witness (a misdemeanor). (§§ 666, 484, subd. (a), 136.1.) He admitted the prior conviction. The trial court placed appellant on formal probation for five years with terms and conditions that included 180 days in the county jail. The court then suspended imposition of sentence for five years.

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code.

Thereafter, appellant was found to have violated his probation twice by committing the offenses of assault on his niece and battery on a spouse or cohabitant. Ultimately, the court continued his probation and ordered him to serve 120 days in jail.

On October 7, 2002, the trial court found that appellant had violated the terms of his probation a third time after he committed the offenses of false imprisonment, battery, and brandishing a knife. (§§ 236, 242, 417.) The court revoked appellant's probation and sentenced him to the middle term of two years in prison.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief raising no issues.

On February 27, 2003, we advised appellant that he had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions that he wished to raise on appeal. We have received no response from him.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

COFFEE, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P.J.

YEGAN, J.

William Bailey, Judge

Superior Court County of Santa Barbara

Gerald Peters, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.